

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-23. Claims 1, 12, 15-17, 19, 21 and 23 and the Specification (Title) are amended herein, and claim 22 has been cancelled herein without prejudice. New claim 24 is added herein. No new matter is presented.

Thus, claims 1-21, 23 and 24 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

SPECIFICATION:

At item 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the Title is not descriptive. The Title is amended herein to read, "DATA INTERCHANGE SYSTEM REALIZING PROCESS LINKAGES AMONG PLURALITY OF SYSTEMS, DATA INTERCHANGE INSTRUMENT REALIZING PROCESS LINKAGES AMONG PLURALITY OF INSTRUMENTS AND METHOD THEREOF."

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Title is descriptive of the claimed invention.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101:

Claims 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. As mentioned above, claim 22 is cancelled herein.

Therefore, withdrawal of the §101 rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶1 as being indefinite. Independent claims 1, 12, 15-17, 19, 21 and 23 are amended herein (claim 22 is cancelled).

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,032,124 (Saito) in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0046072 (Arai).

Independent claim 1 recites "interchanging with the other process executing device interprocess association information indicative of the process executed by the process executing device in association with the process executed by the other process executing device based on a correspondence relation between the process executing data... and the process executed by the other process executing device."

The device of claim 1 enables processes “without a mechanism for sending and receiving of a process identifier [to be] associated with one another among the plurality of process executing devices by sending and receiving data for executing a process”, where “a process that cannot be associated with other processes in said process executing device is associated using association information that associates the process executed by said other process executing devices.” Independent claims 12, 15, 16 and 21 recite similar features.

Independent claim 17 recites, “interchanging process executing data with the external device via a first communication route” and “interchanging with the external device, via a second communication route.” As recited in claim 17, the interprocess association information is “indicative of the process executed by the process executing device in association with the process executed by the external device based on a correspondence relation between the process executing data and the process executed by the external device.” The processes “without a mechanism for sending and receiving of a process identifier are associated with one another among a plurality of process executing devices by sending and receiving data for executing a process” and “a process that cannot be associated with other processes in said process executing device is associated using association information that associates the process executed by said external device.” Independent claim 19 recites similar features.

Claim 23 recites, “obtaining, via a first communication route, interprocess association information associating first and second processes respectively executed by the processor and the external device based on a correspondence relation between the second process and process executing data of the first process.” Claim 23 further recites, “interchanging, via a second communication route, the process executing data and the interprocess association information indicative of said first and second processes between the processor and the external device.” As such, processes “without a mechanism for sending and receiving of a process identifier are associated with one another among a plurality of processors by sending and receiving data for executing a process” and “a process that cannot be associated with other processes in said processor is associated using association information that associates the process executed by said external device.”

In contrast to the claimed invention, Saito is directed to a workflow system which links the business process definition generated inside a first server to the business process definition generated inside a second server for delivering the documents from a first node to a second node (see, col. 2, lines 27-35). The shipping documents in Saito contain IDs of the two processes and are provided with information specifying the entrance/exit processes for

circulation (see, col. 2, lines 56-65 and col. 5, lines 15-28). Meaning, business process definitions are linked in Saito.

On the other hand, Arai discusses determining users of the transfer destination based on a transfer destination description table where users respectively process the document data and the server finally gathers the documents data into one data (see, paragraphs 210 and 308). Thus, Arai is limited to maintaining continuity of work processing by transferring work processing identifier and data pointer to activate the next sub-workflow.

Saito and/or Arai do not teach or suggest the above-discussed features where "processes without a mechanism for sending and receiving of a process identifier are associated with one another... by sending and receiving data for executing a process" and "a process that cannot be associated with other processes... is associated using association information that associates the process executed by said other process executing devices", as recited in each of the independent claims 1, 12, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 23.

It is respectfully submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Saito and Arai.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 5, "wherein said interprocess association information interchanging unit interchanges the interprocess association information at a timing that is not synchronized with the timing for interchanging the process executing data by said process executing data interchanging unit."

Saito and Arai, alone or in combination do not teach or suggest interchanging "interprocess association information at a timing that is not synchronized with the timing for interchanging the process executing data by said process executing data interchanging unit", as recited in claim 5.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 24 has been added to recite, "associating a process within a series of process flows executed by a first of said systems with a process of a second of said systems using process executing data", where the process executing data indicates "an exclusive value in each process of said process flows of said first of said systems and the process of said second of

said systems." Meaning, the claimed invention exchanges "the process executing data for interchanging data of processes executed among said systems."

Saito and Arai, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above discussed features including "associating a process within a series of process flows executed by a first of said systems with a process of a second of said systems using process executing data, the process executing data indicating an exclusive value in each process of said process flows of said first of said systems and the process of said second of said systems", as recited in claim 24.

It is submitted that new claim 24 is patentably distinguishable over Saito and Arai.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 05/07/2007

By: 
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501